IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 2408 of 2002

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

DHARMENDRASINH UDESINH RATHOD

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MS BANNA DATTA FOR MR AR SHAIKH for Petitioner No. 1

MS HANSA PUNANI AGP for Respondents

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE R.P.DHOLAKIA

Date of decision: 10/04/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner - detenu challenging the detention order passed by the detaining authority. The detenu has been detained under the provisions of Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as `the Act of 1985') by order dated 14/7/2001 passed by

the Police Commissioner, Rajkot City and he has been declared as bootlegger.

2. It is now well settled that unless the activities of a person as bootlegger has disturbed the maintenance of public order, he cannot be detained under the Act. Reliance is placed on a decision in the case of Piyush Kantilal Mehta Vs. Commissioner of Police, Ahmedabad & Ors. reported in AIR 1989 SC 491.

3. I have heard learned advocate for the petitioner and also perused the material on record. According to learned advocate for the petitioner, the detaining authority has passed the impugned detention order relying upon the two offences registered against the petitioner before the Rajkot Taluka Police Station under Prohibition Act and statements of two witnesses. The learned counsel for the petitioner has mainly argued that the petitioner has made a representation through his wife on 20/12/2001 which was sent to State Government on 26/12/2001 and, therefore, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, there is a delay in forwarding the representation. The said representation of the petitioner was rejected by the State Government on 27/12/2001 and the petitioner was informed accordingly and the petitioner has received the said intimation on 2/1/2002 through jail and, therefore, according to the learned advocate for the petitioner there is a delay in communicating the decision of the said representation of the petitioner which is unconstitutional. In support of her say, the learned advocate for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in AIR 1981 SC 1126, in which the Honourable Supreme Court has held as under :-

> "We would emphasise that it is the duty of the State to proceed to determine representations of the character above mentioned with the utmost expedition, which means that the matter must be taken up for consideration as soon as such a representation is received and dealt with continuously (unless it is absolutely necessary to wait for some assistance in connection with it) until a final decision is taken and communicated to the detenu. This not having been done in the present case we have no option but to declare the detention unconstitutional. We order accordingly, allow the appeal and direct that the appellant be set at liberty forthwith."

4. Since the detaining authority has not forwarded

the representation of the petitioner and not communicated the decision of the representation of the petitioner promptly, in view of the above judgment relied upon by the learned advocate for the petitioner, the order of detention is illegal and the same cannot be sustained. Learned advocate for the petitioner does not press any other points.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 14/7/2001 passed against the detenu is hereby quashed and set aside. The detenu namely Dharmendrasinh Udesinh Rathod is ordered to be set at liberty forthwith, if not required in any other case. Rule is made absolute accordingly with no order as to costs. D.S. Permitted.

(R.P.DHOLAKIA,J.)

rafik